DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 144 EA 019 870

AUTHOR Sonnek, Ida Mae
TITLE Minnesota School Effectiveness Program. End of Year Report.
INSTITUTION Minnesota State Dept. of Education, St. Paul. Evaluation Section.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Assessment; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Group Discussion; *Interprofessional Relationship; Problem Solving; Program Descriptions; *School Effectiveness; *State Programs; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS Collegiality; Minnesota; *Minnesota School Effectiveness Program

ABSTRACT

In April 1984, 26 schools were selected as pilot sites for the Minnesota School Effectiveness Program (MSEP). A leadership team composed of four teachers, the building principal, and a district office representative from each site participated in a week-long training session sponsored by the Minnesota Department of Education. In August 1984, school effectiveness activities were begun in each pilot site under the guidance of the leadership team, and each pilot site was asked to maintain a monthly log to document the development and implementation of its program. Based on information obtained from these logs and from surveys and interviews with the leadership teams at each pilot site in April and May 1985, this report summarizes and evaluates the results of these school effectiveness programs. Processes used included the nominal group process, force field analysis, conflict management, problem-solving techniques, and the personal profile. The latter was cited by the pilot site faculty as the most significant process for fostering support for school effectiveness efforts. Substantial similarities emerged in the perception of the respondents about most aspects of MSEP; collegiality and professional discussion among faculty and staff were identified as the major positive outcomes, while time and faculty involvement appear to be the most critical variables in the school effectiveness efforts to date. Given the apparent success in implementing these programs at the 26 pilot sites, recommendations are provided for the Minnesota Department of Education to continue and expand their support for school effectiveness efforts. Appended is a sample survey used to determine year-end perceptions of MSEP by a pilot site leadership team. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED291144

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard J. Mesenburg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 019 870

MINNESOTA EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Minnesota Department of Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

End of Year Report

Minnesota
School Effectiveness Program

August, 1985

Ida Mae Sonnek
Evalution Section
Minnesota Department of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES....ii

INTRODUCTION....1

SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS ACTIVITIES AT PILOT SITES....1
- Data Sources....1
- Results....2
  - MSEP Processes Used....2
  - Focus of Pilot Sites' School Effectiveness Programs....3
  - MSEP Characteristics Affected by School Effectivness Programs....4
- Summary....5

PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE MINNESOTA SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS PROGRAM....6
- Data Collection Procedures....6
- Respondents....6
- Analysis of the Survey Responses....6
- Results - Perceptions of Overall MSEP....7
  - Level of Support....7
  - Most Positive Aspect of School Effectiveness Involvement....7
  - Most Difficult Aspect of School Effectiveness Involvement....8
  - Recommendations....8
- Results - Resources Available to Pilot Sites....9
  - Training....9
  - Modules....10
  - Technical Assistance....11
  - School Improvement Survey....11
  - Preliminary Evaluation Report....11
- Summary....11

SUMMARY OF MSEP - 1984-85....12

CONCLUSIONS ABOUT MSEP - 1984-85....13

RECOMMENDATIONS....13

APPENDICES....15
- Appendix A: Sample - Year-End Perceptions of MSEP by Pilot Site Leadership Team Survey....16

LIST OF TABLES

Page

1. MSEP Characteristics in Pilot Sites' School Effectiveness Programs.....3

2. Number of MSEP CCharacteristics Included in Pilot Sites' School Effectiveness Programs.....4

3. MSEP Characteristics Selected by Pilot Sites in Combination with Characteristics #1 - School Goals and #2 - School Climate.....4

4. Characteristics Identified by Pilot Sites as Demonstrating Change Without Specific School Effectiveness Activities.....5

INTRODUCTION

In April, 1984, 26 schools were selected as pilot sites for the Minnesota School Effectiveness Program (MSEP). A leadership team composed of four teachers, the building principal, and a district office representative from each site participated in a week-long training session sponsored by the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE). In August, 1984, school effectiveness activities were begun in each pilot site under the guidance and direction of the Leadership Team.

In order to document the development and implementation of its school effectiveness program, each pilot site was asked to maintain a monthly log. Other efforts to record school effectiveness activities in pilot sites included

1. Personal interviews with selected members of the Leadership Team as well as randomly selected faculty members at selected pilot sites during December, 1984;

2. Interviews with the Leadership Team of each pilot site conducted during April and May, 1985; and

3. Surveys completed by Leadership Team members in November, 1984 and May, 1985.

These documentation activities were developed and monitored by the evaluator of MSEP.

This report represents a summary of MSEP at the pilot site and state levels for 1984-85. This report is based on the information obtained during the April and May interviews of Leadership Teams, the May survey of the Leadership Teams, and the pilot site logs. (The findings of the other interviews and surveys are reported in the evaluation report of MSEP submitted in February, 1985.) This report was prepared by the evaluator of MSEP.

SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS ACTIVITIES AT PILOT SITES

A fundamental principle of school effectiveness efforts is that the individual school is where improvement efforts must begin in order to bring about long-term changes in education. In addition, the research on effective schools indicates that no two school are the same. Therefore, improvement efforts must be personalized and individualized for each school.

Recognizing the importance of these two variables, the Minnesota School Effectiveness Program developed by MDE is a set of processes that should facilitate schools in implementing a school effectiveness program. This is in contrast to a specific formula or recipe for school effectiveness activities.

DATA SOURCES

Respecting the pilot sites' individual approaches to school effectiveness,

the evaluator of MSEP developed a summary of each pilot site's activities for 1984-85. Each summary is based on information obtained through 1) the monthly log; 2) an interview with the Leadership Team to clarify information found in the logs conducted in April or May, 1985; and 3) a year-end survey completed by pilot site Leadership Team members. These summaries can be found in a separate document entitled, Summaries of 1984-85 School Effectiveness Activities of MSEP Pilot Sites.

RESULTS

As was mentioned earlier, MSEP was developed as a set of processes that would facilitate a school in implementing a school effectiveness program. Therefore, MDE encouraged MSEP pilot sites to develop a very individualized school effectiveness program. Further, MDE made a concerted effort to avoid comparisons among pilot sites or indications that one approach to school effectiveness as being better or right.

Yet in preparing the summaries of pilot sites' school effectivenss activities, the evaluator found several trends or similarities among the pilot sites' school effectiveness efforts. It is these trends and similarities that are discussed in this section.

MSEP Processes Used

The analysis of the summaries revealed that Leadership Teams are using the processes of MSEP in implementing their school effectiveness programs in their respective schools. The processes mentioned by the Leadership Team members included the nominal group process, force field analysis, conflict management, problem-solving techniques, and the Personal Profile.

First, the process that was identified as most useful was the Personal Profile. The completion of the Personal Profile by pilot site faculty was cited as the most significant process for fostering support for school effectiveness efforts.

Second, all pilot sites participated in some form of a goal-setting activity. Nine of the pilot sites used a goal-setting process to develop school/building goals while 23 of the 26 pilot sites used the goal-setting process to select the MSEP characteristics they wanted to address as part of their school effectiveness program. Five of the pilot sites reported that their goal-setting activity was the major school effectiveness activity for 1984-85 and the purpose of which was to identify their school effectiveness goals for 1985-86.

Third, 13 of the pilot sites divided their faculty into smaller units. The units included such organizational structures as task forces, committees, departments, unit or grade levels. These units were typically formed after the faculty had selected the characteristics that were to be the focus of their school effectiveness program. The purpose of these units typically was to develop and implement improvement efforts for the characteristics selected as the focus for the pilot site's school effectiveness program.

Fourth, three pilot sites expanded their Leadership Teams. One pilot site incorporated an existing faculty committee into the Leadership Team. Leadership Team members of another pilot site asked individual faculty members to join the team. The purposes of expanding the Leadership Teams included 1) to redistribute the workload related to school effectiveness among more persons and 2) to foster a greater commitment to school

effectiveness among additional faculty members.

Focus of Pilot Sites' School Effectiveness Programs

Leadership Team members were asked to to categorize their school effectiveness efforts in terms of the 15 MSEP characteristics. Leadership Team members indicated that they either conducted activities that addressed specific characteristics or identified changes that they perceived had occurred in their school according to specific characteristics. Table 1 shows the MSEP characteristics cited by Leadership Team members as having been a part of their school effectiveness program or were affected by these efforts.

TABLE 1

MSEP CHARACTERISTICS
IN
PILOT SITES' SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS PROGRAMS

MSEP Characteristics	Number of Pilot Sites
Characteristic # 1 - School Climate	26
Characteristic # 2 - School Goals	25
Characteristic # 6 - Collaborative Planning and Collegial Relationships	13
Characteristic # 9 - Parental Involvement	12
Characteristic #13 - Cooperative Learning	8
Characteristic #15 - Order and Discipline	8
Characteristic #10 - High Expectations	5
Characteristic # 8 - Curriculum Articulation	4
Characteristic # 5 - District-level Support	3
Characteristic #11 - Teacher-designed Instruction	3
Characteristic #14 - Teacher-student Interaction	3
Characteristic # 7 - Staff Development	2
Characteristic #12 - Flexible Grouping	2
Characteristic # 3 - Building-level Leadership	1
Characteristic # 4 - School-site Management	1

An integral part of the pilot sites' school effectiveness programs during 1984-85 was awareness. Twenty-five of the 26 pilot sites reported that the Leadership Team had conducted some form of awareness activity. Most frequently the Leadership Team conducted an activity to insure that the pilot site faculty was familiar with MSEP and the 15 characteristics. In addition, the Leadership Team conducted awareness activitities for the School Board, district staff, parents and the community.

One pilot site devoted the entire year to creating awareness among its faculty. The faculty selected the characteristics that they were most interested in learning more about. These characteristics became the focus of study throughout the year.

Second, pilot sites were free to select the number of MSEP characteristics they wanted to address in their school effectiveness programs. The average number of MSEP characteristics selected was four. Table 2 shows the number of pilot sites that selected MSEP characteristics.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF MSEP CHARACTERISTICS INCLUDED
IN
PILOT SITES' SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS PROGRAMS

Number of MSEP Characteristics Selected	Number of Pilot Sites
4	9
2	6
7	4
5	3
3	2
8	1
11	1

Third, when a pilot site selected more than two MSEP characteristics to address as part of its school effectiveness program, the combination of MSEP characteristics selected most frequently included Characteristics #1 - School Goals and #2 - School Climate. Table 3 shows the frequency in which the other MSEP characteristics were selected in combination with Characteristics #1 - School Goals and #2 - School Climate.

TABLE 3

MSEP CHARACTERISTICS SELECTED BY PILOT SITES
IN COMBINATION WITH
CHARACTERISTICS #1 - SCHOOL GOALS AND #2 - SCHOOL CLIMATE

MSEP Characteristics	Number of Pilot Sites
Characteristic # 6 - Collaborative Planning and Collegial Relationships	12
Characteristic # 9 - Parental Involvement	12
Characteristic #12 - Cooperative Learning	8
Characteristic #15 - Order and Discipline	7
Characteristic # 5 - District-level Support	3
Characteristic #11 - Teacher-designed Instruction	3
Characteristic #14 - Teacher-student Interaction	3
Characteristic # 7 - Staff Development	2
Characteristic #12 - Flexible Grouping	2
Characteristic # 3 - Builing-level Leadership	1
Characteristic # 4 - School-site Management	1

MSEP Characteristics Affected by School Effectiveness Programs

As was mentioned previously, Leadership Team members identified activities and changes related to specific MSEP characteristics. The analysis of this data showed that in most pilot sites changes were described for a characteristic when activities had been conducted that addressed the particular characteristic. Nine pilot sites reported changes for all the characteristics for which there had been activities conducted. In addition, 13 of the 26 pilot sites attributed changes to at least half of the characteristics for which school effectiveness activities had been directed. Only one pilot site reported no changes for any of the

charactertistics that it had selected.

Second, ten pilot sites identified changes for characteristics for which there had been no specific school effectiveness activities conducted. One pilot site reported conducting activities for only two MSEP characteristics but perceived that changes had occurred for 11 characteristics. Another pilot site reported conducting activities for two MSEP characteristics but reported changes had occurred in seven characteristics. Table 4 shows the number of pilot sites that reported changes for MSEP characteristics when no specific school effectiveness activities related to the characteristic had been conducted.

TABLE 4

CHARACTERISTICS IDENTIFIED BY PILOT SITES
AS
DEMONSTRATING CHANGE WITHOUT SPECIFIC SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS ACTIVITIES

MSEP Characteristics	Number of Pilot Sites
Characteristic # 9 - Parental Involvement	7
Characteristic #15 - Order and Discipline	4
Characteristic #10 - High Expectations	3
Characteristic #13 - Cooperative Learning	3
Characteristic #14 - Teacher-student Interaction	3
Characteristic # 2 - School Climate	2
Characteristic #12 - Flexible Grouping	2
Characteristic # 3 - Building-level Leadership	1
Characteristic # 4 - School-site Management	1
Characteristic # 5 - District-level Support	1
Characteristic # 6 - Collaborative Planning and Collegial Relationships	1
Characteristic # 7 - Staff Development	1

SUMMARY

The analysis of the summaries of the pilot sites' school effectiveness activities indicates the following.

1. Pilot sites are using the processes of MSEP in implementing their school effectiveness programs.

2. The completion of the Personal Profile by pilot site faculties was perceived as the most significant process in facilitating the school effectiveness efforts.

3. All pilot sites have been involved in a goal-setting process.

4. Pilot sites used a variety of organizational structures to accomplish school effectiveness activities.

5. Pilot sites identified that they had either specifically addressed or perceived changes for an average of four of the MSEP characteristics which typically included Characteristics #1

- School Goals and #2 - School Climate.

6. Pilot sites reported perceiving changes in the characteristics in which they had directed their school effectiveness efforts.

7. Pilot sites reported that they perceived changes within MSEP characteristics even though school effectiveness activities had not been directed toward them.

PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE MINNESOTA SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS PROGRAM

In May, 1985, Leadership Team members at each pilot site were asked to complete a survey form, Year-End Perceptions of MSEP by Pilot Site Leadership Teams (Appendix A). The purpose of the survey was twofold:

1. To gain some insight about overall perceptions about MSEP after one year's involvement; and

2. To determine the usefulness of the resources made available to pilot sites during 1984-85.

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

The original mailing included forms for the four teachers, the building principal and the district representative, all of whom comprised the Leadership Team. Forms were mailed to the principals at the pilot sites. They were asked to distribute the forms to the individual team members. The principal was asked to contact the evaluator of MSEP for additional forms if their site had expanded the number of Leadership Team members. Approximately 150 forms were sent in the original mailing.

A self-addressed stamped envelope was attached to each form to insure the confidentiality of the individual team members.

RESPONDENTS

At the time of the data analysis, 120 forms had been received. Of the 120, 80 were from teachers, 23 principals, and 17 district representatives. Eight of the teacher respondents and one of the principals indicated that they became members of the Leadership Teams when it had been expanded. Three principal respondents and one district representative indicated that they had replaced a member of the original Leadership Team. At least one reponse was received from each of the 26 pilot sites. Four or more responses were received from 22 of the 26 pilot sites.

ANALYSIS OF THE SURVEY RESPONSES

The goal of this survey was to describe the perceptions about MSEP. The respondents to the survey included members of the Leadership Teams. Since the Leadership Teams are comprised of teachers, principals, and district representatives, responses on the survey were analyzed in terms of these three groups.

In reporting the results of this survey, differences among the groups of the respondents are noted. The reader should be aware that these

differences represent only possible trends rather than being statistically significant differences. Because of the small number of respondents within each group, it was impossible to determine the statistical significance of the differences, that it, whether the differences are real or just chance occurrences.

RESULTS - PERCEPTIONS OF OVERALL MSEP

In completing the survey, Leadership Team members were asked to rate and/or make comments about MSEP in several areas. These areas are:

1. The level of support for school effectiveness activities shown by
   a. Faculty and staff
   b. District administration;

2. The most positive aspect of involvement in school effectiveness

3. The most difficult aspect about being involved in school effectiveness

4. Recommendations for improvement of MSEP
   a. State level
   b. Pilot site level

Level of Support

Faculty and Staff - The respondents of the three groups most frequently indicated that support for school effectiveness was growing among the faculty and staff. One-third of the respondents stated that the support of the faculty and staff had been "consistently supportive" throughout the year. Only a very small number of respondents indicated that the support was either declining and/or the faculty and staff had been unsupportive.

District Administration - Teacher and principal respondents rated the district administration as being "consistently supportive." District representatives held a similar perception.

Most Positive Aspect of School Effectiveness Involvement

Two major themes emerged in the analysis of the comments provided by teacher and principal respondents, in particular. Teacher and principal respondents identified that their school's involvement in school effectiveness activities facilitated the following.

1. Positive collegial relationships had developed. This collegiality was reported to be among 1) the Leadership Team members themselves, 2) the entire faculty and staff within the pilot site and 3) teachers and Leadership Teams in other schools/pilot sites.

2. School effectiveness activities provided opportunities for professional discussions and input into school improvement efforts by faculty and staff in pilot sites.

In addition, both teacher and principal respondents mentioned the significance of the training and workshops made available to them as part

of their school effectiveness involvement.

Although the analysis of the comments of district representative respondents showed references to the themes of collegiality, professional discussions and the training and workshops, a distinct pattern of themes did not emerge as it had for the other two groups of respondents.

Most Difficult Aspect of School Effectiveness Involvement

Clearly the most difficult part of a pilot site's involvement in school effectiveness activities was the time element. The time element included:

1. Planning time for the Leadership Team

2. Meeting time for faculty
   a. To provide the level of information to insure their understanding of the school effectiveness program
   b. To work on and complete school effectiveness related activities

3. Finding the "right" kind of time to conduct school effectiveness activities:
   a. The appropriate number of hours to plan and complete school effectiveness activities
   b. The time of day conducive to planning and completing school effectiveness activities

This concern about time was mentioned by 65% or 52 of the 80 teacher respondents, 82% or 14 of the 17 district representative respondents and 74% or 17 of the 23 principal respondents.

Another area of difficulty identified by the teacher respondents, in particular, was dealing with the attitude of the faculty and staff. Teacher respondents reported needing to convince faculty and staff about the importance and relevance of school effectiveness efforts.

Recommendations

State Level - Having identified time as a difficulty, the three groups of respondents indicated the need for MDE to assist in helping them address the time issue. This recommendation was more frequently made by the principal and district representative respondents.

Teacher, principal and district representative respondents, also, indicated a desire that MDE continue to support their efforts in school effectiveness. This support was defined in terms of materials, training, the development of associations with colleges and universities, availability of consultants.

Teacher and principal respondents recommended that MDE establish a formal system for networking across sites. This networking could take the form of newsletters, statewide meetings or utilizing the expertise of staff in pilot sites in other MSEP sites.

Principal and district representative respondents indicated a need for further and consistent definition of roles and responsibilities in several areas. First, they saw a need for clearer definition between the roles of the MDE staff and the ESCU/Regional Facilitator. Second, these groups

cited the need to establish evaluation procedures for their involvement in MSEP.

Individual groups of respondents made recommendations for the statewide MSEP. District representative respondents stressed the importance of legislative support for school effectiveness efforts and MDE's role in securing and maintaining that support. Teacher respondents indicated a need to have training opportunities offered closer to their pilot site location.

Pilot Site - As was the situation for the state level recommendation, time was the primary recommendation for pilot site school effectiveness program. District representative, principal and teacher respondents recommended that time be made available spcificially for school effectiveness activities.

Teacher respondents provided several other recommendations. First, they indicated a need for more staff involvement in school effectiveness activities. They recommended expanding the number of members of the Leadership Team, systematically rotating membership of the Leadership Team or making it possible for other faculty and staff to particiapte in Leadership Team training opportunities. Second, this group stressed the importance of the all Leadership Team members being trained in the MSEP process.

The district representative respondents, also, had a specific recommendation. They indicated the importance of being able to tie all district programs (e.g. PER, staff development, curriculum development) and school effectiveness together in a coordinated effort.

RESULTS - RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO PILOT SITES

Throughout 1984-85, Leadership Teams and the staff of pilot sites had available various types of resources to assist them in the development and implementation of their school effectiveness program. The resources included training, written materials, technical assistance, a preliminary evaluation report and the results of a needs assessment.

Training

Leadership Team Training - June, 1984 - The overall perception about this training experience was quite favorable. Teacher, principal and district representative respondents typically rated the following components of this leadership team training as "very helpful":

1. Overview to the 15 MSEP Characteristics
2. Overview to the School Improvement Process
3. Personal Profile
4. Goal-Setting Process.

For the remaining components of this leadership team training, there were small differences among the three groups of respondents, although the overall perception of the groups tended to be favorable.

Establishing an Effective School Climate tended to be perceived as "very helpful" for teacher and principal respondents. The rating of this component by the district representative respondents was equally divided between "somewhat helpful" and "very helpful."

Problem-Solving was found to be "very helpful" for the principal respondents. Teacher and district respresentative respondents tended to perceive this component as either "somewhat helpful" or "very helpful." It should be noted that the analysis showed a small proportion of both the teacher and district respresentative groups rating this componenet as "no help" or "not sure."

Coaching of Teaching was typically rated as "somewhat helpful" for all three groups. In addition, the analysis showed that the same number of respondents in all three groups perceived this component as "no help" or "not sure" as rated it "very helpful."

Overview of Evaluation Process was generally found to be evenly divided as "somewhat helpful" and "very helpful" for district representative respondents. There was a tendency among the teacher and principal respondents to rate this component as "no help" or "not sure."

Overview of Planning Process was preceived as "very helpful" by the principal and district representative respondents. The teacher respondents tended to divide their ratings between "very helpful" and "somewhat helpful."

Leadership Team Training - November, 1984 - The teacher and principal respondents tended to rate this training session as "somewhat helpful" or "very helpful." District representative respondents typically rated this session lower than the principal and teacher groups.

Principal and District Representative Training - January, 1985 - This training session was designed only for the principals and district representatives of the pilot sites. Thus, only the responses of these two groups were considered in the analysis of this training.

This training opportunity was typically rated positively by the respondents. There seemed to be a tendency for both principal and sitrict representative respondents to rate the Concern-Based Adoption Model component somewhat lower than the Situational Leadership component.

Optional Training Opportunities - Training in Teacher Expecations of Student Achievement (TESA), Cooperative Group Learning and Use of Task Forces were offered to pilot sites to assist them in their school effectiveness activities. These opportunities were defined as optional. The individual pilot sites made the decision regarding participation.

It should be noted that the number of respondents across all three groups tended to be quite small. For example, 13 of the 80 teacher responding to the survey indicated participation in TESA; 32 in Cooperative Group Learning and 15 in Use of Task Forces.

Among those respondents indicating participation, Cooperative Group Learning and Use of Task Forces were rated as "very helpful" with TESA being rated as "somewhat helpful" to "very helpful."

Modules

Through the course of the year, pilot sites recieved five modules to assist them in their school effectiveness activities. The module topics included 1) school goals, 2) collaborative planning and collegial

relationships, 3) cooperative group learning, 4) problem-solving and conflict management and 5) expectations.

The three groups tended to rate all the modules as being "somewhat helpful" to "very helpful" except for the module on expectations. This module was consistently rated as being "somewhat helpful."

Technical Assistance

At least one Facilitator in each of the ESCU regions and MDE staff were available to provide technical assistance to the pilot sites. The major types of assistance provided by these two groups were 1) planning with the pilot site Leadership Teams; 2) leading a specific school effectiveness activity at the request of a Leadership Team and 3) providing resources about various aspects of school effectiveness to pilot sites.

Regional Facilitators - Across the three groups of respondents, all types of assistance provided by the Regional Facilitator were rated as being "somewhat helpful" and "very helpful." The Regional Facilitator as activity leader and Regional Facilitator as provider of resources were consistently perceived as "very helpful."

MDE Staff - All types of technical assistance provided by MDE staff were rated consistently as "very helpful" by the respondents of the three groups.

School Improvement Survey

The Leadership Team was asked to have faculty and administration of their pilot site to complete the School Improvement Survey. MDE provided each pilot site the results of the survey for their pilot site. In some pilot sites, the Regional Facilitator met with the Leadership Team to interpret the results.

The analysis indicated that the teacher and principal respondents divided their responses between "somewhat helpful" and "very helpful" while the district representative respondents perceived the completion of this survey as only "somewhat helpful." It should be noted that there was a proportion of the respondents in both the teacher and principal groups that perceived the usefulness of the survey as "no help" or "not sure."

Preliminary Evaluation Report

An report on MSEP was prepared by the evaluator of the MSEP and submitted to the Minnesota State Legislature in February, 1985. A presentation of the report's findings was made by the evaluator to pilot site principals and district representatives in January, 1985. In addition, the each Leadership Team was provided a copy of the report.

Teacher and principal respondents indicated that the report was "somewhat helpful" while district representative respondents perceived the report as being "very helpful." The principal and teacher respondents more frequently perceived the report as being of "no help" or "not sure" than the district representative respondents.

SUMMARY

The perceptions of the teacher, principal and district representative

respondents concerning their involvement in MSEP and the various resources made available to assist in their school effectiveness activities were generally positive. Most aspects of MSEP and most of the resources were rated as being "somewhat helpful" to "very helpful."

Time and faculty and staff involvement appear to be the most critical variables in the school effectiveness efforts to date. Collegiality and professional discussions among staff were identified as the major positive outcomes for MSEP pilot sites during 1984-85.

SUMMARY OF MSEP - 1984-85

Pilots sites appear to be finding the processes of MSEP useful in implementing their school effectiveness activites. Pilot sites perceived that there have been changes in their school that they attribute to school effectiveness activities. Pilot sites appear to be satisfied with their involvement in MSEP as well as the resources that have been made available to them as MSEP pilot sites.

There tended to be a great deal of similarity in the perceptions of the teacher, principal and district representative respondents about most of aspects of MSEP. When differences among the three groups were found, it seems that the differences could be attributed, in part, to the professional applicability of the particular resource. For example, teacher respondents may perceive Cooperative Group Learning and TESA as being able to help them in their teaching while district representative respondents may not be as interested in these areas. This could account for the difference in the number of teacher and district representative respondents indicating participation in TESA and Cooperative Group Learning training. In contrast, a district representative may need to know how a program like MSEP will be evaluated while teachers may not identify evaluation as a high interest area. Again, this difference in professional interest may account for the differences found in the perceptions about the preliminary evaluation report that was provided in February, 1985.

Time and staff and faculty involvement appear to be the two most critical variables in the school effectiveness efforts to date. The frequency in which time was mentioned as an area of difficulty, along with the recommendations at both the state and pilot site levels to find ways to build in more time for school effectiveness activities, makes it a program management priority.

Collegiality and professional discussions among faculty and staff were identified as the major positive outcomes for school effectiveness pilot sites during 1984-85 for teacher respondents, in particular. Faculty and staff were perceived as being supportive of school effectiveness efforts. Despite these two positives, the importance of staff involvement and support was emphasized by teacher respondents. This group indicated gaining staff support was a significant stumbling block this year and their recommendations included the need to develop strategies to insure more involvement for staff.

The summaries of the pilot sites' school effectiveness programs indicated that several pilot sites were developing strategies to address the major concerns related to time and staff involvement. For example, the districts of several pilot sites have allocated either inservice days or a budget

specifically for school effectiveness for the 1985-86 school year. Several pilot sites have lightened the workload and time commitment of their Leadership Teams by expanding the number of Leadership Team members. Other pilot sites divided their faculties into smaller organizational units to accomplish school effectiveness activities or increase the commitment on the part of additional faculty members to school effectiveness. These examples were included in the recommendations of the Leadership Team members.

CONCLUSIONS ABOUT MSEP - 1984-85

Based on the findings presented in this report, the general conclusions about MSEP for 1984-85 are as follows.

1. All the pilot sites have implemented a school effectiveness program.

2. Teachers, principals and district representatives who are members of the pilot sites' Leadership Teams appear to be satisfied with their involvement in MSEP and the resources it had provided them.

3. Although Leadership Teams identified concerns and made recommendations about such problems as time and staff involvement related to school effectiveness, several pilot sites have experimented with several strategies (e.g. expansion of the Leadership Team, using task forces) in an attempt to deal with these issues.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the apparent success in implementing school effectiveness programs in the 26 pilot sites as well as the apparent satisfaction among the Leadership Teams with their involvement with MSEP, the recommendations that follow are directed toward MDE.

1. MDE should continue to support the school effectiveness efforts of the pilot sites through continued training, materials, and technical assistance for Leadership Teams and/or pilot site faculty. This would insure that the pilot sites have the skills and knowledge to address the priority areas in their school improvement efforts.

2. MDE should support the development of a network among school effectiveness sites. This would enable sites to share and become aware of activities and strategies that may have applicability across sites. In addition, this would enable MDE to monitor and provide about the success of innovative and creative techniques developed and used by pilot sites to address some of the problems (e.g. time, staff involvement) related to school effectiveness efforts with other sites.

The support of pilot sites through resources and availability of a school effectiveness site network would facilitate continued involvement and

satisfaction with MSEP on the part of pilot sites.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE

YEAR-END PERCEPTIONS OF MSEP BY PILOT SITE LEADERSHIP TEAM SURVEY

Year-End Perceptions of MSEP
by
Pilot Site Leadership Teams

Instructions: This questionnaire is designed to gather your impressions and judgments about the Minnesota School Effectiveness Program in your school during 1984-85. Please read each question and check the response which is best. There are no right or wrong answers.

I. What has been your role on the Leadership Team?

___Teacher

___Principal

___District Representative

II. Check the response that best describes you:

___A. I participated in the Leadership Training in June, 1984 and have served as a member of the Leadership Team throughout 1984-85.

___B. I replaced a leadership team member.

___C. I became a member of the leadership team when it was expanded to include more members.

III. The following resources have been made available to you as a pilot site to facilitate your efforts related to School Effectiveness. First, tell us whether you used or participated in the following. Second, for each one you used or participated in, please indicate the extent to which it was helpful in facilitating School Effectiveness efforts in your school.

	Yes	No	Not Sure	Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	No Help	Not Sure
A. Training							
1. Leadership Team Training (June, 1984)							
a. Overview of 15 MSEP Characterisitics.....							
b. Overview of School Improvement Process....							
c. Personal Profile							
d. Goal Setting Process.....							
e. Establishing an Effective School Climate..							
f. Problem Solving.....							
g. Coaching of Teaching.....							
h. Overview of Evaluation Process.....							
i. Overview of Planning Process.....							
2. Leadership Team Training (November, 1984)							
a. Goal Setting Process.....							
b. Training Options.....							
3. Principal and District Representative Training (January, 1985)							
a. Situational Leadership.....							
b. Concerned-based Adoption Model.....							
4. Optional Training Opportunities							
a. TESA.....							
b. Cooperative Learning.....							
c. Use of Task Forces.....							

	Yes	No	Not Sure	Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	No Help	Not Sure
B. Modules							
1. School Goals							
2. Collaborative Planning and Collegial Relationships							
3. Cooperative Learning Groups							
4. Problem-Solving and Managing Conflict							
5. Expectations							
C. Assistance by Regional Facilitators							
1. Assist Leadership Team in Planning MSEP Activities							
2. Serve as Leader of MSEP Activities at Pilot Site							
3. Provide Resources About MSEP							
4. Other Please specify:							
D. Assistance by MDE Staff							
1. Assist Leadership Team in Planning MSEP Activities							
2. Serve as Leader of MSEP Activities at Pilot Site							
3. Provide Resources About MSEP							
4. Other Please specify:							
E. McRel School Improvement Survey							
F. Preliminary Evaluation Prepared by MDE Evaluation Section							

IV. Please check ( ) the type of overall support for MSEP demonstrated by the following groups:

	Consistently Supportive	Growing Momentum of Support	Declining Support	Consistently Unsupportive
A. Faculty and Staff	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Dist. Administration	_____	_____	_____	_____

V. You were asked to address two (2) specific MSEP characteristics as part of this year's participation in MSEP. Describe specific changes related to each of the designated characteristics that you would attribute to MSEP activities.

A. Characteristic #1: School Goals

B. Characteristic #3: School Climate

VI. Did you identify any other characteristic(s) to work toward?

____ A. Yes

____ B. No

C. If so, what characteristic(s):

D. Describe specific changes related to each characteristic that you would attribute to MSEP activities.

VII. What has been the best thing about MSEP?

VIII. What has been the most difficult thing about MSEP?

IX. What recommendations, if any, do you have for improving MSEP -

A. At your school:

B. Statewide: